



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/253,153 02/19/99 SCHWABACHER

A

EXAMINER

HM12/0328

KAROLINE K M SHAIR
CHOATE HALL & STEWART EXCHANGE PLACE
53 STATE STREET
BOSTON MA 02109

GARCIA, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1627

DATE MAILED:

03/28/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/253,153

Applicant(s)

Schwabacher

Examiner

Maurie E. Garcia, Ph. D.

Group Art Unit

1627



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ONE month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claims 1-36 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☒ Notice to Comply

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Please note: The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to **Group Art Unit 1627**.

Also Note: In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1627 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is 703-305-3704. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this Pilot program. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

Specification

1. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures.

Election/Restriction

2. Claims 14-37 have been renumbered as claims 13-36 as there was no claim 13 filed in the instant application.

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-7, drawn to an array of chemical compounds attached to a support, classified in various classes depending on the compounds, for example, class 436, subclass 528.
- II. Claims 8-23, drawn to a method of preparing an array of compounds, classified in various classes depending on the compounds, for example, class 435, subclass 7.1 or class 530, subclass 334.
- III. Claims 24-32, drawn to a method of measuring a property, classified in class 436, subclass 172.
- IV. Claims 33-36, drawn to a method of obtaining structure-activity relationships, classified in various classes and subclasses depending on the type of activity measurement, for example, class 436, subclass 52.

4. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

5. Groups I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the arrays could be made by a different process such as by subjecting the support to different reagents along its length as it is run through a synthesis system in a unidirectional fashion.

6. Groups I and III & IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the arrays of compounds could be used in a materially different process, such as being used as starting materials from which other libraries could be made.

7. Groups II, III and IV are different methods. The methods are different because they use different steps, require different reagents and will produce different products and/or results. They therefore have different issues regarding patentability and enablement and represent patentably distinct subject matter. In the instant case, the methods of using the arrays (Groups III and V) are clearly different from the method of making the arrays (Group II) as a synthesis method has completely different steps and a different end result than a method of measuring properties (Group III) or determining structure activity relationships (Group IV). The two methods of use are different from each other: Group IV requires that the datapoints for each compound are arranged in a linear array and are Fourier transformed; Group III does not have any of these requirements but does require transporting the compounds through a detector.

8. These inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter. Different methods and products

would require completely different searches in both the patent and non-patent databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention. If applicant elects the invention of Group II, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. **Note:** one species from each subgroup should be chosen.

Subgroup I: Species of support

Species 1: Single material	Claims 9, 10
Species 2: Composite	Claim 11
Species 3: Discontinuous	Claim 12

Subgroup II: Species of arrays

Species 1: Contains duplicates	Claims 16, 22
Species 2: Contains single copies	Claims 17, 23

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the groups have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

10. If applicant elects the invention of Group III, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species.

Species of arrays

Species 1: Contains duplicates	Claim 29
Species 2: Contains single copies	Claim 30

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the groups have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

11. If applicant elects the invention of Group IV, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species.

Species of arrays

Species 1: Contains duplicates	Claim 35
Species 2: Contains single copies	Claim 36

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the groups have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

12. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

13. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

14. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

15. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

16. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).


17. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

18. Applicant is also reminded that a 1 - month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for response when a written requirement is made without an

action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program, see MPEP 809.02(a).

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie E. Garcia, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00 and alternate Fridays.

20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Macmillan, can be reached on (703) 308-4614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


KEITH D. MACMILLAN
SUPERVISOR

Maurie E. Garcia, Ph.D.
March 22, 2000

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to these regulations, published at 1114 OG 29, May 15, 1990 and at 55 FR 18230, May 1, 1990.
- ☒ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☒ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other: Applicant should follow the format of the attached sample statement to request that the CRF filed in the parent application be used to create a CRF in this application.

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", as well as an amendment directing its entry into the specification.
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (703) 308-4216

For CRF Submission Help, call (703) 308-4212

PatentIn Software Program Support (SIRA)

Technical Assistance.....703-287-0200

To Purchase PatentIn Software.....703-306-2600

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR RESPONSE